Appl. No.: 09/852,438
Amdt. Dated September 15, 2005

REMARKS

Claims 2 and 10 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 9, and 17 have been amended to particularly specify that the multipoint processor unit is capable of demultiplexing input from the non-H.323 terminal into call signaling and call control information and into media information and transferring the call signaling and the call control information to the multipoint controller over H.248/Megaco. This amendment is supported throughout the specification and particularly by original claim 2.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnaswamy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,867,494) in view of Shaffer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,738,343). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Each of the independent claims have been amended to include the limitation requiring that at least one of the plurality of multimedia terminals is a non-H.323 terminal that does not support H.323 protocol and that the multipoint processor unit is capable of demultiplexing input from the non-H.323 terminal into call signaling, call control, and media information; and transferring the call signaling and the call control information to the multipoint controller over H.248/Megaco.

The primary reference, Krishnaswamy, does not teach these limitations. Though the Examiner stated that Krishnaswamy teaches a multipoint processor unit that is capable of demultiplexing input from a non-H.323 terminal into call signaling and call control information and transferring the call signaling/control information to the multipoint controller,[1] the text cited by the Examiner in fact teaches that *a gateway*, not a multipoint processor, provides translation between various protocols. Referring to the Krishnaswamy specification, the multipoint controller is discussed at col. 131, ll. 23-36 and the gateway is discussed at col. 131, ll. 37-50.

---

[1] *See*, Office Action dated June 27, 2005, p. 5.

Krishnaswamy does not teach a *multipoint processor unit* that is capable of demultiplexing input from a non-H.323 terminal; rather, this task is accomplished by a *gateway*.

One of skill in the art will appreciated that one of the difficulties of using decomposition MCU to communicate with an endpoint that uses a standard other than H.323 (e.g., H.320, H.324) is that signaling, control, and media are multiplexed and a H.323 MCU cannot handle the multiplexed signals. Thus, most systems, such as the system described by Krishnaswamy, require a gateway to translate between the protocols. Krishnaswamy specifically states, "The H.323 Gateway provides appropriate translation between the various transmission formats." Col. 131, ll. 38-39. Thus, the multipoint processor of Krishnaswamy actually handles only one protocol, H.323, because the gateway translates the other protocols to H.323. The gateway is specifically illustrated in Fig. 19C, wherein it is shown that the H.323 server includes a Gateway, which is separate from the MCU. *In sum, Krishnaswamy teaches a system having a gateway that demultipxes input from a non-H.323 terminal, rather than a multipoint processor that demultipxes input from a non-H.323 terminal, as is required by the present claims.*

The secondary reference, Shaffer, also fails to teach a multipoint processor that demultipxes input from a non-H.323 terminal. In fact, Shaffer states that his invention is applicable to "any network in which *separate media and signaling channels are used. . .*" Col. 3, ll. 8-9. Thus, Shaffer never purports to handle multiplexed signal. Shaffer does not appear to teach demultiplexing media and signaling channels, either using a multipoint processor unit or any other component.

In sum, the combined references do not teach every claim limitation. As shown above, the references do not teach using a multipoint processor unit that is capable of demultiplexing input from a non-H.323 terminal into call signaling and call control information and into media information. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

No fees are believed to be due at this time. However, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct any necessary fees from Deposit Account No. 501922, referencing matter no. 199-

Appl. No.: 09/852,438
Amdt. Dated September 15, 2005

0121US. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned with any questions relating to this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _Sept. 15, 2005_

Raymond Reese
Reg. No. 47,891

Wong, Cabello, Lutsch, Rutherford
          & Brucculeri, LLP
20333 SH 249
Houston, Texas 77070
Tel: (832) 446-2453
Fax: (832) 446-2424

Page 9 of 9